Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 20 1967
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

Term, A.D. 1967

No. 1081

VISIDOR CORP., a corporation of the State of New Jersey,

Petitioner,

v.

BOROUGH of CLIFFSIDE PARK, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

LOUIS EISENSTEIN,
WITTMAN, ANZALONE & BERNSTEIN,
(Frederick L. Bernstein)
Constitution Square South,
25 East Salem Street,
Hackensack, New Jersey,
Attorneys for Petitioner.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

Term, A.D. 1967

No.

VISIDOR CORP., a corporation of the State of New Jersey,
Petitioner,

v.

BOROUGH of CLIFFSIDE PARK, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

To the Honorable, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Your petitioner respectfully shows:

(a) The Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Bergen County, wrote an opinion reported in 86 N.J. Super 169, 206 A. 2d 206 (1965). The Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, reversed the judgment of the Law Division; its opinion is reported in 90 N.J. Super 126, 216 A. 2d 408 (1966). The opinion of the New Jersey Supreme Court, which reversed the judgment of the Appellate Division, is reported in 48 N.J. 214 (1966).

(b) The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked to review the final judgment of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, the highest court in the State of New Jersey.

(i) The date of the opinion, judgment and mandate of the New Jersey Supreme Court is November 21, 1966.

(ii) There were no orders or applications respecting a rehearing, nor have there been any orders or applications respecting the granting of an extension of time within which to petition for certiorari.

(iii) Jurisdiction in this Court to review the judgment by writ of certiorari is invoked under section 1257 of Title 28 of the United States Code, and is required to be exercised to protect against a taking of the petitioner's rights of property without due process of law, in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

(c) The questions herein presented for review are:

(i) Is the doctrine of sovereign municipal immunity from tort liability, of non-redressible injury when done by a state or government official, constitutional?

(ii) May a state, in the name of sovereign immunity, take away a private right of action for damages sustained by being compelled to render obedience to an illegal police regulation?

(iii) Where the sovereign admits to having taken illegal police action resulting in special harm and direct property losses to an individual citizen, is the uncompensated damage *damnum absque injuria* or is the same constitutionally required to be redressible as a taking and damaging "for public use, without just compensation" under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States?

(d) The case involves the following provisions of the Constitution of the United States:

> Amendment V. ". . . [N]or shall any person . . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."
>
> Amendment XIV. ". . . No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. . . ."

(e) Petitioner, owner and operator under lease of a restaurant and tavern, filed this action to recover for the wrongful action of the defendant borough, a municipal corporation of New Jersey, in materially damaging its business by cutting off a route of access thereto. The municipality admitted to having illegally designated the street leading to petitioner's parking lot as a one-way street. No traffic was allowed to make direct entry thereto from a heavily-trafficked roadway, and the municipality's answer to the complaint admitted that the police action in so designating the street as one-way was "arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable and illegal." There was no denial of illegal action, substantial loss to the petitioner proximately caused thereby, and of material, deliberate interference with the petitioner's rights of access and ingress.

The case was heard in the trial Court on a stipulation of facts, but dismissed on a theory that the doctrine of governmental immunity in New Jersey was not such "as to permit a suit for damages." After an Appellate Division reversal, the New Jersey Supreme Court affirmed this dismissal, holding that municipalities were entitled to protection "against endangering financial demands" and that the Borough's conduct was, on a balancing of factors,

"fairly and justly to be viewed as nontortious or as otherwise immune."

There remains for decision whether the rationale employed by the New Jersey courts to deny redress against illegal governmental action is a valid and supportable exercise of state policy measured against federal constitutional guaranties. That is to say, while all rights of property are held subject to the police power, subject to the establishment and implementation of all regulations that are reasonably necessary to secure the health, safety, good order, comfort, or general welfare of the community, this is the first decision impliedly announcing that these constitutionally protected rights of property are subject also to illegal and admittedly unreasonable exercises of the state police power.

In Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon, 260 U.S. 393, 43 S. Ct. 158 (1922), this Court held that if a state law were applied to the case, the statute would be "admitted to destroy previously existing rights of property and contract. The question is whether the police power can be stretched so far. . . ."

> "The general rule at least is that while property may be regulated to a certain extent, if regulation goes too far it will be recognized as a taking."

So too here, the conduct of the municipality was not merely unreasonable but actually unlawful. None of the policy considerations alluded to by the New Jersey Supreme Court discloses "a public interest sufficient to warrant so extensive a destruction of the [petitioner's] constitutionally protected rights." 43 S. Ct., at page 159.

Whether the doctrine of governmental immunity is ordained by state statutes or legislated by court decision is of no consequence. In either event, generally and particularly as applied to the facts of this case, it represents the

exercise of an arbitrary power by the state, to the injury of the persons and property of citizens of the United States. It is settled that the Fourteenth Amendment expresses a limitation against the actions of "public agents transcending the limits of lawful authority, even when acting in the name and wielding the force of the government." Hurtado v. California, 110 U. S. 516, 4 S. Ct. 11, 121 (1884). Suggesting that their actions are immune from suit, even when patently illegal and destructive of a man's business, goes far in making limitless state power over the holding of property. In order not to be a taking within the meaning of the due process clause, it should be held that police acts must be done in the proper and legitimate exercise of governmental power and must be within those limitations on the amount of destruction or impairment of the value of property rights which public authorities have heretofore been permitted to occasion without the necessity of paying compensation therefor.

WHEREFORE, your petitioner prays that a writ of certiorari issue to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey to the end that the errors aforesaid may be corrected by this Court.

LOUIS EISENSTEIN
WITTMAN, ANZALONE & BERNSTEIN

By: FREDERICK L. BERNSTEIN
Attorneys for Petitioner

APPENDIX

Opinion

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY

No. A-9, September Term, 1966

—o—

Visidor Corporation, a corporation of the State of New Jersey,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

Borough of Cliffside Park, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey,

Defendant-Appellant.

—o—

Argued September 27, 1966. Decided Nov. 21, 1966.

On certification to the Appellate Division.

Mr. Leon S. Wolk argued the cause for the appellant (Messrs. Wolk & Simonson, attorneys).

Mr. Joseph N. Marotta, Jr. argued the cause for the respondent.

The opinion of the Court was delivered by

Jacobs, J.

The Appellate Division, in an opinion reported under the name of *DeCarlo* v. *Cliffside Park,* at 90 *N.J. Super.* 126 (1966), reversed the Law Division's dismissal of the damage claim of the plaintiff Visidor Corporation against the defendant Borough of Cliffside Park. 86 *N.J. Super.* 169 (1965). We granted certification on the Borough's application. 46 *N.J.* 539 (1966).

Opinion

Visidor operates a tavern and restaurant in a building located on Palisade Avenue in Cliffside Park and leased from Dominick DeCarlo. The building is at the corner of Marion Avenue and Palisade Avenue, directly opposite the Palisades Amusement Park. A parking lot in the rear of the building is used in connection with the tavern and restaurant and is accessible only from Marion Avenue. In March 1961 the Borough decided that Marion Avenne, along with Wayne Avenue and Franklin Avenue to the south thereof, should be made a one-way street. Directional signs were installed and as a result traffic could no longer enter Marion Avenue from Palisade Avenue. A motorist wishing to park in the rear would enter Wayne Avenue, then turn right on an undedicated strip of land, formerly a trolley car right of way, and then right again into Marion Avenue.

In March 1964 Visidor and DeCarlo filed a two-count complaint in lieu of prerogative writ. The first count alleged that the Borough's designation of Marion, Wayne and Franklin Avenues as one-way streets was illegal in that it was never authorized by an ordinance having the approval of the Division of Motor Vehicles as required by *N.J.S.A.* 39:4-197, *N.J.S.A.* 39:4-8 and *N.J.S.A.* 39:4-202. The relief sought under the first count was a declaration that the designation of the avenues as one-way streets was void and of no effect. The second count alleged that the illegal designation of Marion Avenue as a one-way street constituted a private nuisance which had caused financial loss to DeCarlo and to Visidor in that its business had been greatly reduced by virtue of the Borough's action. The relief sought under the second count was a judgment for money damages.

After the Borough admitted that no ordinance having departmental approval had ever been adopted, a motion for summary judgment was made as to the first count, and on April 17, 1964 a summary judgment was entered

voiding the one-way designation. Thereupon the Borough removed the directional signs and the avenues were then conducted as two-way streets. In December 1964 the matter went to trial on the second count. DeCarlo acknowledged that he had suffered no damage and his claim was dismissed without any ensuing appeal. Visidor pressed the claim that it had suffered loss of profits during 1961-64 in the aggregate sum of $15,000 but the trial court dismissed this claim as well. It held that the law would not recognize any such damage claim against the Borough on the basis of the illegal designation of the avenues as one-way streets. 86 N.J. Super. at 174. Visidor appealed the dismissal to the Appellate Division, which reversed in a brief per curiam embodying its view that Visidor's case came within the New Jersey precedents which hold that municipalities have no immunity from tort claims for damages resulting from their "active wrongdoing." 90 *N.J. Super.* at 127; see *McAndrew* v. *Mularchuk,* 33 *N.J.* 172, 181 (1960); *Hayden* v. *Curley,* 34 *N.J.* 420, 424 (1961).

In *Mularchuk* a municipal patrolman shot and wounded a young man who thereafter sued the municipality, alleging that it had negligently sanctioned the arming of the patrolman with a dangerous weapon without having adequately trained him in its use. In holding that there could be recovery, we pointed to the widespread attacks on sovereign immunity throughout the country and to the expanding applications within New Jersey of its doctrine that a municipality may be held accountable for injurious acts performed in its governmental capacity when they constitute active wrongdoing. 33 *N.J.* at 181-82, 190-96. In the many jurisdictions which have gone even further than New Jersey in disavowing sovereign immunity, a municipality may be held accountable though its negligence is grounded on acts of omission, rather than on acts of commission which are subsumed in New Jersey under the terminology

of active wrongdoing. Thus in *Holytz* v. *City of Milwaukee*, 17 *Wis.2d* 26, 115 *N.W.2d* 618 (1962) the Wisconsin Supreme Court, after referring to New Jersey's doctrine, pointed out that its own abrogation of municipal immunity would "apply broadly to torts, whether they be by commission or omission." 115 *N.W.2d* at 625; see *Prosser, Torts* 1010-13 (*3d ed.* 1964); 2 *Harper and James, Torts* 1619-27 (1956); *California Law Revision Commission, A Study Relating to Sovereign Immunity* 260-66 (1963).

Although the out-of-state cases abrogating municipal and other governmental immunity speak in very broad terms, they recognize that certain types of governmental activity must remain free from any resulting damage claims because they are properly viewed as nontortious or are otherwise deemed immune for controlling policy reasons. In *Hargrove* v. *Town of Cocoa Beach*, 96 *So. 2d* 130, 133 (*Fla.* 1957) the Florida Supreme Court, in allowing an action against a city for wrongful death resulting from the negligence of a municipal police officer, abrogated prior holdings of municipal immunity, but in the course of its opinion took pains to point out that the abrogation would not "impose liability on the municipality in the exercise of legislative or judicial, or quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial, functions as illustrated in such cases as Elrod v. City of Daytona Beach, 132 Fla. 24, 180 So. 378, 118 A.L.R. 1049; and Akin v. City of Miami, Fla. 1963, 65 So. 2d 54." *Elrod* rejected a damage claim against a city grounded on its enforcement of an allegedly unconstitutional ordinance restricting house-to-house mercantile solicitation within the city limits; and *Akin* rejected a damage claim against the city based on its alleged illegal refusal to issue a building permit. See also *Modlin* v. *Washington Avenue Food Center*, 178 *So. 2d* 596, 601 (*Fla. Dist. Ct. App.* 1965); *Calbeck* v. *Town of South Pasadena, Florida*, 128 *So. 2d* 138, 139 (*Fla. Dist. Ct. App.* 1961); *Annot.*, 37 *A.L.R. 2d* 694 (1954); *Annot.*, 118 *A.L.R.* 1054 (1939).

When the Kentucky Court of Appeals discarded municipal immunity in an action against a city for a child's death allegedly caused by the city's negligent operation of a swimming pool, it stated, as the Florida court had in *Hargrove,* that its opinion was not to be construed as imposing liability on a municipality for damages resulting from the exercise of its legislative functions. *Haney* v. *City of Lexington,* 386 *S.W.* 2*d* 738, 742 (*Ky.* 1964). Similarly in *Spanel* v. *Mounds View School District No. 621,* 264 *Minn.* 279, 118 *N.W.* 2*d* 795 (1962) the Minnesota Supreme Court, in prospectively announcing that the rule of sovereign tort immunity would no longer be recognized as a defense with respect to claims against school districts, municipal corporations and other governmental subdivisions, noted that it did "not suggest that discretionary as distinguished from ministerial activities, or judicial, quasi-judicial, legislative or quasi-legislative functions may not continue to have the benefit of the rule." 118 *N.W.* 2*d* at 803. See also *Muskopf* v. *Corning Hospital District,* 55 *Cal.* 2*d* 211, 11 *Cal. Rptr.* 89, 359 *P.* 2*d* 457, 462 (1961); *Eipman* v. *Brisbane Elementary School District,* 55 *Cal.* 2*d* 224, 11 *Cal. Rptr.* 97, 359 *P.* 2*d* 465, 467 (1961); *Holytz* v. *City of Milwaukee, supra,* 115 *N.W.* 2*d* at 625.

When Congress provided for the wide allowance of tort claims against the government, it specifically excluded, *inter alia,* claims based on acts or omissions of governmental employees exercising due care "in the execution of a statute or regulation, whether or not such statute or regulation be valid," or based "upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty." 28 *U.S.C.A.* § 2680; see *Harper and James, supra* § 29.14; 3 *Davis, Administrative Law* § 25.08 (1958); *Prosser, supra* § 125 at 999. In *Dupree* v. *United States,* 247 *F.* 2*d* 819 (3 *Cir.* 1957) the court applied this exclusion in support of its rejection of a damage claim based on the

Coast Guard's allegedly wrongful refusal to issue security clearance to the plaintiff; in the course of his opinion, Judge Kalodner noted that the Federal Tort Claims Act did not contemplate "a remedy for damages sustained by reason of the application of invalid laws or regulations." 247 *F. 2d* at 824-25.

Even in jurisdictions where legislative waivers of sovereign immunity have been adopted without stated exceptions, exclusions comparable to the cited one in the federal act have been read into the legislation. In *Evangelical United Breth. Church of Adna* v. *State*, — *Wash. 2d* —, 407 *P.2d* 440 (1965), the court rejected a claim against the state for damages from arson committed by a boy who had escaped from a juvenile correctional facility where a so-called "open program" was being followed. Washington's comprehensive legislative waiver was held not to contemplate the allowance of such claims grounded on the alleged invalidity of official determinations as to how the facility should be run; those determinations were described as "purely discretionary if not quasi-judicial" in nature and as nontortious. 407 *P.2d* at 447. The New York's legislative waiver of immunity has been properly described as a sweeping one. See Herzog, "Liability of the State of New York for 'Purely Governmental' Functions," 10 *Syracuse L. Rev.* 30 (1958). Nonetheless, its courts have refused to recognize liability for damages resulting, either from so-called discretionary determinations by municipal and other governmental officials, or from action taken pursuant to legislative enactment or administrative regulation. See *Weiss* v. *Fote*, 7 *N.Y.2d* 579, 200 *N.Y.S.2d* 409, 167 *N.E.2d* 63 (1960); *Rottkamp* v. *Young*, 21 *A.D.2d* 373, 249 *N.Y.S.2d* 330 (1964), affirmed 15 *N.Y.2d* 831, 257 *N.Y.S.2d* 944, 205 *N.E.2d* 866 (1965); *Granger* v. *State*, 14 *A.D.2d* 645, 218 *N.Y.S.2d* 742 (1961); *cf. Terrace Hotel Co.* v. *State*, 46 *Misc.2d* 174, 259 *N.Y.S.2d* 553 (*Ct. Cl.* 1965), affirmed 26 *A.D.2d* 23, 270 *N.Y.S.2d* 460 (1966); see also

Jaffe, "Suits Against Governments and Officers: Damage Actions," 77 *Harv. L. Rev.* 209, 237 (1963).

In our own State, recent decisions have made it plain that, even if we were to go further in our restriction of sovereign immunity, as some of us firmly believe we should (*cf. East Orange* v. *Palmer*, 47 *N.J.* 307, 328 (1966)), there would nevertheless remain the need for declaring non-liability for certain areas of official conduct, either as non-tortious or as otherwise immune. Thus in *Hoy* v. *Capelli*, 48 *N.J.* 81 (1966) it was held that a municipality could not be found liable in damages because of its failure to reinstall a traffic light at the intersection where the accident later occurred; in the course of his opinion, Justice Hall referred to the so-called discretionary exception recognized elsewhere and pointed out that, for policy reasons and regardless of the appropriate label or categorization, no damage claim could be grounded on the alleged invalidity of the governmental determination with respect to the installation or non-installation of the traffic device. 48 *N.J.* at 87-91.

In *Amelchenko* v. *Borough of Freehold*, 42 *N.J.* 541 (1964) the municipality, confronted with the effects of a snowstorm, had done some clearing but had not as yet cleared its municipal parking lot when the plaintiff slipped there and injured himself. In holding that the plaintiff's claim for damages was properly dismissed, Justice Francis remarked that municipal determinations as to the amount of snow removal equipment to be purchased, and as to the number of men to be assigned to snow removal, were matters of judgment which should not be tested in tort actions. 42 *N.J.* at 549; see *Fitzgerald* v. *Palmer*, 47 *N.J.* 106, 110 (1966). He pointed out that the general method of handling snowstorms was a matter of planning entrusted to local officials who should be free to determine it "without fear of liability either for themselves or for the public entity they represent." 42 *N.J.* at 550. It may here appropriately

be noted that the non-liability of individual public officials for damages ensuing upon their good faith exercise of judgment and discretion in the performance of their duties, has long been recognized in our State. See *Bedrock Foundations, Inc.* v. *Geo. H. Brewster & Son, Inc.*, 31 *N.J.* 124, 140-45 (1959); *Tyrell* v. *Burke*, 110 *N.J.L.* 225 (*E. & A.* 1933); *Valentine* v. *Englewood*, 76 *N.J.L.* 509 (*E. & A.* 1908).

Municipalities have been vested with broad regulatory powers for the advancement of the public health, safety or welfare (*R.S.* 40:48-1 *et seq.*); these of course encompass customary traffic regulations including the designation of one-way streets. *R.S.* 39:4-197. If the Borough had proceeded through an approved ordinance designating Marion Avenue as a one-way street, there presumably would have been the economic business loss, but society could rightly expect that Visidor bear such loss without recourse. That much is not disputed by Visidor. *Cf. Tubular Service Corp.* v. *Com. State Highway Dept.*, 77 *N.J. Super.* 556 (*App. Div.*), affirmed 40 *N.J.* 331 (1963); see *California Law Revision Commission, A Study Relating to Sovereign Immunity, supra* at 434-37. It claims, however, that since here the Borough did not so proceed, the illegality of its action may in itself be deemed a sufficient basis on which to support the damage claim. If this approach were accepted, damages could be recovered from a municipality whenever there was a showing of harm resulting from municipal zoning, licensing or other restriction later declared invalid. The absence of any right to such damages has been generally assumed in our State. Though our law reports are full of proceedings for the setting aside of restrictive municipal ordinances and resolutions, none, so far as we know, has ever been accompanied or followed by any damage recovery. Elsewhere the courts have for policy reasons expressly denied such recovery with substantial consistency. See *Rott-*

kamp v. *Young, supra,* 249 *N.Y.S.* 2*d* at 335; *McCray* v. *City of Lake Louisville,* 332 *S.W.* 2*d* 837, 842 (*Ky.* 1960); *Fidelity Laboratories* v. *Oklahoma City,* 191 *Okla.* 473, 130 *P.* 2*d* 834, 836 (1942); *Kramer* v. *City of Jefferson,* 233 *Mo.App.* 685, 124 *S.W.* 2*d* 525, 526 (1939); *Lindeman* v. *City of Kenosha,* 206 *Wis.* 364, 240 *N.W.* 373, 375 (1932); *City of Chicago* v. *New York, C. & St. L.R. Co.,* 216 *F.* 725, 740 (7 *Cir.* 1914); *Hershberg* v. *City of Barbourville,* 142 *Ky.* 60, 133 *S.W.* 985, 986 (1911).

In his administrative law treatise, Professor Davis voiced current approval of the principles underlying the cited decisions; as he put it, "invalidity of governmental action, without more, clearly should not be a basis for liability for harm caused by the action." *Davis, supra* § 25.12; *but cf. California Law Revision Commission, A Study Relating to Sovereign Immunity, supra* at 437-38. Along the same line, the 1963 California statute explicitly provided that there would be no liability for action taken in good faith "under the apparent authority of an enactment that is unconstitutional, invalid or inapplicable." *Cal. Gov't.* §§ 820.6, 815.2 (*Deering Supp.* 1965); Comment, California Tort Claims Act, 39 *So. Cal. L. Rev.* 470 (1966). Similarly the 1965 Illinois statute provided that good faith action under an invalid enactment is immune to the same extent it would be if the enactment had been valid. 84 *Ill. Annot. Stat.* §§ 2-203, 2-109 (*Smith & Hurd* 1966); Comment, Illinois Tort Claims Act, 61 *Nw. U.L. Rev.* 265 (1966).

Though Visidor's complaint here spoke in terms of nuisance, we are concerned with the operative facts rather than the label. *Hartman* v. *Brigantine,* 23 *N.J.* 530, 535 (1957). The Borough's action was presumably taken in good faith and with unawareness that it was defective. It was rescinded as soon as the trial court declared it to be invalid. Visidor's alleged business harm could have been substantially eliminated if it had proceeded in March 1961 upon

the installation of the directional signs. Our court rules contain ample provision for summary application and for advancement of trial (*R.R.* 4:88; *R.R.* 4:58) and when, in March 1964, Visidor finally decided to bring legal action, it obtained summary relief during the very next month. Although the Borough's action was declared to have been procedurally illegal, the establishment of one-way streets was admittedly within the proper province of the Borough and the procedural requirement for a duly approved ordinance was clearly designed not for the protection of economic business interests but to advance the interests of safety and uniformity in traffic regulation. See *Librizzi* v. *Plunkett,* 126 *N.J.L.* 17, 20 (*Sup.Ct.* 1940); *Eveler* v. *Atlantic City,* 91 *N.J.L.* 135, 137 (*Sup. Ct.* 1918).

Here, as throughout the law, a balancing of the pertinent factors should be determinative. See Jaffe, *supra,* 77 *Harv.L.Rev.* at 219. On that approach we are satisfied that the Borough's action is fairly and justly to be viewed as nontortious or as otherwise immune and that the damage claim must consequently fail. This result is in full accord not only with the judicial precedents but also with the modern legislative trends. It serves to protect municipalities against endangering financial demands and to permit their governing bodies to govern conscientiously for the public interest, as they find it, without the fears and burdens of litigating such demands. It does this while preserving very effective and expeditious remedies, perhaps more freely and broadly available in our State than in any other (*Walker* v. *Stanhope,* 23 *N.J.* 657, 661 (1957)), for the setting aside of invalid official action.

Reversed.

Mandate on Reversal

SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSEY

Appeal Docket No. 4995

Civil Action On Appeal

VISIDOR CORPORATION,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

vs.

BOROUGH OF CLIFFSIDE PARK,

Defendant-Appellant.

This cause having been duly argued before this Court by Mr. Leon S. Wolk, counsel for the appellant and Mr. Joseph N. Maretta, Jr., counsel for the respondent, and the Court having considered the same,

It is hereupon ordered and adjudged that the judgment of the said Superior Court, Appellate Division is in all things reversed, set aside and for nothing holden, with costs; and it is further ordered that this mandate shall issue ten days hereafter, unless an application for rehearing shall have been granted or is pending, or unless otherwise ordered by this Court, and that the record and proceedings be remitted to the said Superior Court, Appellate Division to be there proceeded with in accordance with the rules and practice relating to that court, consistent with the opinion of this Court.

Mandate on Reversal

WITNESS the Honorable Joseph Weintraub, Chief Justice, at Trenton on the 21st day of November, 1966.

MORTIMER SHERMAN
Acting Clerk of the Supreme Court

A True Copy

JOHN H. GILDEA
Clerk

Filed
Nov 21 1966
JOHN H. GILDEA
Clerk

...ME COURT, U.S.

MAR 8 1967

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1966

No. 1081

VISIDOR CORP., a corporation of the State of New Jersey,

Petitioner,

v.

BOROUGH OF CLIFFSIDE PARK, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey,

Respondent.

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION TO GRANTING WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PAUL L. BASILE
Borough Attorney for Respondent
646 Anderson Avenue
Cliffside Park, New Jersey 07010

PAUL L. BASILE
Of counsel

Martin Lutz Appellate Printers, Inc.
New York • Philadelphia • Newark • New Brunswick.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Brief 1

Table of Citations

CASES CITED:

Pan Am Petroleum Corp. v. Superior Court of Delaware, 366 U.S. 656, 81 Sup. Ct. 1303, 6 L. Ed. (2) 584 (1961) 2

Visidor Corp. v. Borough of Cliffside Park 48 N.J. 214, 225 A.2d 105 (1966) 2

OTHER AUTHORITIES CITED:

16 Am. Jur. "Constitutional Law" Sec. 116, p. 307 2

18 McQuillen, Municipal Corporations (3rd Ed. 1950) Sec. 53.35, pp. 227-231 2

Rynme on Municipal Corporations, p. 431 ... 2

3 Yokeley Municipal Corporations, Sec. 493, p. 177 2

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1966

No.

VISIDOR CORP., a corporation of the State of New Jersey,
Petitioner,

v.

BOROUGH OF CLIFFSIDE PARK, a municipal corporation of the State of New Jersey,
Respondent.

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION TO GRANTING WRIT OF CERTIORARI

The first, and perhaps the paramount reason why the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari should not be granted in this case is that petitioner has not shown that it has any "right of property" or "right of action" of which it has been deprived.

If the respondent had followed the New Jersey Statutory procedure, and obtained the approval of the New Jersey Director of Motor Vehicles in advance, the placing of a "one-way" street sign

would be a proper exercise of the police power, for which the Respondent Borough would not be liable for damages, 18 McQuillen Municipal Corporations, (3rd Ed. 1950) Sec. 53.35 pp. 227-231; 3 Yokeley Municipal Corporations (1958), Sec. 493, p. 177; Rhyne on Municipal Corporations (1957) p. 431.

Not a single case, from New Jersey or any other jurisdiction, has been cited by the petitioner in the briefs filed in the trial court or the New Jersey Appellate courts where it was held that a tenant was entitled to recover money damages from a municipality by reason of the placing of an unauthorized traffic direction sign. The authorities upon which petitioner relied in the New Jersey courts are cited and distinguished in the opinion of the New Jersey Supreme Court, a copy of which is annexed to the Petition for Certiorari. 48 N.J. 214, 225 A.2d 105 (1966).

Petitioner is seeking Certiorari on the ground that its "rights" under Amendments V and XIV of the United States Constitution have been violated. It is hornbook law that where a litigent relies upon a constitutional question, it must be specially pleaded and raised in the first instance. Pan Am Petroleum Corp. v. Superior Court of Delaware, 366 U.S. 656, 81 Sup. Ct. 1303, 6 L. Ed. (2) 584 (1961); 16 Am. Jur. "Constitutional Law" Sec. 116 p. 307.

Petitioner's Complaint in the trial court, the Pretrial Order and the briefs filed in all the New Jersey Courts fail to raise any question of any violation of petitioner's "rights" under the United

States Constitution. This issue is being raised for the first time in the Petition for Certiorari, without having been raised in, or passed upon by the New Jersey courts.

It is submitted that petitioner's application for Certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL L. BASILE
Borough Attorney
Attorney for and of Counsel
with Borough of Cliffside Park
Respondent.